

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

June 3, 1998
MAG Office, Ocotillo Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

VOTING MEMBERS

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| * Carl Doak, Chandler | Lisa Ruane, Peoria |
| Mark Weiner, Gilbert | Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.) |
| Pat Thurman, Glendale | Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water) |
| * Joe Evans, Goodyear | * Rod Ramos, Scottsdale |
| Bob Erdman, MCDOT | * Andy Goh, Tempe |
| Doug Davis, Mesa | |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * David Tantalean, AGC | Jeff Benedict, ARPA |
| * Jim Grose, AGC | Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering |
| Paul Nebeker, UTCA | * Mike Bonar, ACEA |

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:50 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 6, 1998 were approved with one correction. The representative from Maricopa County Department of Transportation, Bob Arviso, last name was corrected to read "Arviso".

3. Discussion on Submitted Cases

- a. **Case 98-01** - Section 103.6.2 - Indemnification: Pat Thurman provided the latest revision dated June 3, 1998 for this case. The revisions consisted of several changes as discussed in last month's meeting. See last month's meeting minutes and the cover memo provided in this meeting for the latest changes to the case. Doug Davis inquired as to the minimum amount of property damage the other cities carry (self insured). Most members did not know the amount. He asked the other members to return with their amount at the next meeting. If the consensus

is one million (similar to Mesa), than it would be best to change the amount from the ½ million proposed in the case to one million dollars.

- b. **Case 98-02** - Misc. Errors and Omissions: No discussion on this case.
- c. **Case 98-03** - Section 738 - HDPE: Since the sponsor of the case did not attend the meeting, all discussions regarding the case was postponed to next month.
- d. **Case 98-04** - Section 775 - Concrete masonry units (Block): The Committee had no comments, suggestions or corrections on this case. A motion was presented and seconded for a vote. The case (version dated April 1, 1998) was unanimously approved with a vote of 6 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.
- e. **Case 98-05** - Section 321 - Asphalt Concrete Pavement: Based on the discussion from last month's meeting, a revised case dated May 18, 1998 was placed in this month's packet. A short discussion was held on the wording in 321.5.2 (A), 7th paragraph regarding the use of the "self-propelled mechanical spreading and finishing equipment." Even though the word "paver" is a very common word, it was changed since paver had not been defined in previous text. Several modifications were recommended in the 3rd paragraph of 321.5.4. Also, the word "scale" will be reviewed for a typo in the 7th paragraph. This case should be ready for a vote in the next meeting.
- f. **Case 98-06** - Section 340 - Concrete Sidewalk Ramps: Based on the comments from last month's meeting, a revised case dated May 18, 1998 was placed in this month's packet. There was a short discussion as to the purpose of the case. See the memo dated April 8, 1998 and last month's minutes for the items discussed. The committee had no further comments, suggestions or corrections on the case. This case should be ready for a vote in the next meeting.
- g. **Case 98-07** - Section 105.5 - Project Superintendent: The Committee had no comments, suggestions or corrections on this case. A motion was presented and seconded to the committee for a vote. The case (version dated April 8, 1998) was unanimously approved with a vote of 6 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.
- h. **Case 98-08** - Section 756, Details 360 & 362 - Fire hydrants: The committee members recommended two changes in the details. The first change was to Detail 360. The minimum distance was changed from 2 inches to 1 inch [25 mm]. The second change was to Detail 362. The clear radius should be changed from 24 inches to 36 inches [900 mm]. A motion was presented and seconded for a vote on this case with the above recommended changes. The case (version dated April 16, 1998) was approved with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no and 1 abstained (MCDOT).

4. Submittal, Review, and Discussion of New Cases:

- a. Doug Davis presented Case 98-09 - Detail 533 and 536 - Type 'D' Catch Basin. A copy of the case was provided in this month's packet. Doug provided a short discussion as the reason for the case. See supporting memo dated May 18, 1998 regarding the reasons. The details in this month's packet were hand draft copies. Doug passed out the first computer drafted copies to the members (no date).
- b. Doug Davis presented Case 98-10 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete. A copy of the case was provided in this month's packet. Doug provided a short discussion on the reason for the case. See supporting memo dated June 3, 1998 regarding the reasons. Pat Thurman had some concerns regarding the wording of the 1st paragraph of 710.3.3. After some discussion, Jeff Benedict will consult the local industry and provide an alternate wording. He will submit the change within the next two weeks. Also a typo was noted in the proposed wording for 710.3.6.

5. General Discussion:

- a. As requested in last month's meeting, Paul Ward provided a tentative schedule for his staff's processing of the MAG revisions. This included the Public Works Committee's approval, checking/proofing by the Specification & Details Committee and the publishing of the changes. The schedule is an effort to reduce the time for approval and publishing of the cases. The members will review the schedule and return comments.
- b. Peter Kandarlis informed us of a meeting he attended of utility companies. The purpose of the meeting is to find some common ground between the various agencies in the seal coating of their streets once the utility company has worked in the street. One of the hold-ups in implementing any standardization is the \$1.00 per yard cost to be submitted by the utility company to the agency. No agency will accept the \$1.00 at today's costs to surface the streets. Peter would like to see his subsection be changed. Doug suggested that Peter rewrite the subsection in a generic format so inflation will not effect the cost and present it to the committee. The case could be introduced next year.
- c. Jeff Benedict informed the committee that ADOT is planning to increase the number of rubber asphalt projects to a point where it could severely effect the cities from obtaining rubber asphalt for their projects. ADOT intends to issue 125 project using rubber asphalt by Sept 30, 1998. Also, Paul Ward informed the committee that the federal government should be signing the TEA-21 funding for the states. The current program will increase the amount of funding to Arizona by approximately 59% over last year. This money must be spent in a relative short time. This will further increase the demand on contractor's that specialize in road work.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p. m.